



GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND PROGRAM PLANNING

Fiscal Note 2011 Biennium

Bill #	SB0243	Title:	Constitutional amendment to require majority vote in general elections
Primary Sponsor:	Balyeat, Joe	Status:	As Introduced

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached |

FISCAL SUMMARY

	<u>FY 2010 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2011 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2012 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2013 Difference</u>
Expenditures:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Revenue:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Impact-General Fund Balance:	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>

Description of fiscal impact: The bill requires that in a general election, a majority of votes is needed in order to be elected. This bill has a significant fiscal impact on county governments.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Effect on County or Other Local Revenues or Expenditures:

1. If more than two candidates ran, and none received the majority, a runoff election would be in order. There would be a significant impact for counties to run another election, including costs for judges, equipment programming, ballot printing, and polling places. Cost estimates for a regular general election (based on 2006 general election) are \$1.6 million.

Technical Notes:

1. The bill does not specify how a majority of votes would be obtained when there are more than two candidates and none of the candidates receive a majority.

Sponsor's Initials

Date

Budget Director's Initials

Date